DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 768 EC 092 068

AUTHOR Delaney, Ann K.
TITLE Developing a Quality-Control Mechanism for Evaluation and Placement of Exceptional Children: Educational Based Appraisal System.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 107p.; Maxi II Practicum Report, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Projects; *Educational Diagnosis; Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicapped Children; *Individualized Curriculum; *Individualized Instruction; *Practicums; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Student Evaluation; Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS Educational Based Appraisal System; Texas (Collin Country)

ABSTRACT

Described is the development of the Educational Based Appraisal System, a model whereby educational diagnosticians and teachers in Collin County (Texas) could work together in developing effective individual educational programs for exceptional children. Sections cover the following topics: statement of the problem, conceptualizing a solution, developing a practicum design (which includes referral; screening; data analysis; comprehensive individual assessment; involvement of an admission, review, and dismissal committee; dissemination of the written educational plan; and program evaluation), ascertaining the required inputs, executing a practicum, evaluating results of the practicum, suggesting further applications, and following up. It is noted that the model proved to be a useful quality control mechanism. Appended are tables showing the effectiveness rating of special education supportive services in Collin County and effectiveness rating of educational plan forms. (SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED132768

Developing a Quality-Control Mechanism for Evaluation and Placement of Exceptional Children: Educational Based Appraisal System

by Ann K. Delaney

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, Nova University

EC092068

Dallas I Cluster
Dr. Frank Alexander, coordinator

Maxi II report
January 31, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ABSTRACT . . . . . (i)

INSTRODUCTION. . . . . (ii)

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1

CONCEPTUALIZING A SOLUTION 6

DEVELOPING A PRACTICUM DESIGN 7

ASCERTAINING THE REQUIRED INPUT 18

EXECUTING A PRACTICUM 22

EVALUATING RESULTS OF THE PRACTICUM 29

SUGGESTING FURTHER APPLICATIONS. 39

FOLLOWING UP 41

TABLES

1. Total personnel involved within EBAS in Collin County 15
2. Time schedule for personnel involved in EBAS project 17
3. Personnel responding to a needs assessment to revised appraisal process in Collin County. 19
4. Responses to questionnaire concerning needed competencies in specific areas of Special Education instruction. 20
5. Teachers' reactions to the effectiveness of the EBAS project within their classrooms 36
6. Teachers' reactions to effectiveness of educational plan forms. 38

APPENDIX A: Effectiveness rating of Special Education supportive services in Collin County 48

APPENDIX B: Effectiveness rating of educational plan forms 70

BIBLIOGRAPHY 71

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to develop an educational based appraisal system that would serve as a model to provide logical answers to some of the demonstrated needs and problems relative to student evaluation and placement in special education services. The model was designed and tested, and ensuing investigation proved it to be a useful quality-control mechanism. Subsequent application of a refined form of the model in 14 additional school districts in 1976-77 may provide valuable experience and insight to further the cause of "Plan A" Special Education in the Texas public school system.

INTRODUCTION

The problem dealt with in this practicum exercise concerned the need for a system whereby educational diagnosticians and teachers in Collin County (Texas) could work together in developing effective individual educational programs for exceptional children. A solution to this problem was offered through the development of a model entitled Educational Based Appraisal System. The communication vehicle for implementation of this model in Collin County's school districts was a manual for educational diagnosticians, developed by the practicum director to assist diagnosticians with supporting teachers in the development of useful educational plans through a uniform system of appraisal, placement, and programming of exceptional children served by those teachers.

The practicum design (called EBAS in this practicum report) was evolved during the summer of 1975, and was tested in schools served by the Collin County Special Education Cooperative program in the first semester of the 1975-76 school year. Due to constraints imposed by the time line of this practicum exercise and ensuing report, some components written into the practicum project were not completed during the course of the school year's first semester. However, the EBAS will be concluded at the end of the present semester (second term of the 1975-76 school year) and its results will be studied in order that the practicum director might make needed refinements and additions to the project. These additions

will hopefully assist other school personnel in carrying out the precepts of this practicum design in their districts in an independent manner. The practicum director expects to extend the EBAS model into 14 additional school districts during the 1976-77 school year, and if positive consequences occur during that expanded trial period, she then will approach a publisher concerning the promulgation of the EBAS model in its refined form at a future date.

Tables and appendices which substantiate results of the practicum design are included in this practicum report, as well as a bibliography to which the reader may refer for confirmation of the practicum director's study sources for this research.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A need has been demonstrated for the development of a uniform technique whereby educational diagnosticians can effectively formulate educational plans derived from instructionally relevant data, can consult with teachers and other personnel involved in a student's instructional program, and can monitor the effectiveness of a student's written educational plan. A great deal of confusion has arisen, since the introduction in 1970 of a comprehensive program for Special Education (entitled "Plan A") into Texas' public schools, concerning the job role of an educational diagnostician and the methods which should be utilized to implement that role.

In accordance with Texas Education Agency guidelines, most "Plan A" Special Education evaluation programs have three primary objectives. These are:

1. determination of a student's eligibility for Special Education services and appropriate instructional placement.
2. development of an appropriate educational program for the student
3. determination of the effectiveness of a handicapped student's educational program

Information gained from carefully compiled research (Kaufman, Agard, Vlasak, 1972) suggests that there are disparities existing between the intended processes which are the objectives of a diagnostician's appraisal process, and reported practices which appear to be operative.

Because of disparities in test data interpretation, many Special Education teachers do not put into practice recommendations set forth in students' individual educational plans. A survey of 22 Special Education resource teachers in Collin County revealed that the majority (17) of those teachers had not received any worthwhile prior training (in their college coursework) pertaining to the reading and interpretation of individual diagnostic data in addition to their studies of group testing techniques. Educational diagnosticians apparently have not been aware of teachers' lack of expertise in this area, because they have continued to couch their diagnostic findings in clinical-type phrases and terms incomprehensible to a great many teachers. As a result of this lack of communication, most individual educational plans have been viewed by Special Education teachers as being of little value to them. Many Special Education classes have been turned into "remedial" settings rather than "alternative" educational programs, thus robbing the classes of their true intent and rendering the appraisal of exceptional students worthless.

This problem is not confined to Collin County. A group of Black parents in Dallas, Texas, filed suit during the fall of 1974 against Dallas I.S.D., charging that their children were wrongfully placed in Special Education classes, in order to maintain racial segregation in the Dallas schools. According to those parents, the children were discriminated against in regard to their cultural differences, with the school district's disregarding

the fact that none of the children had proven mental or physical handicaps. Additional charges were brought regarding testing procedures used to place the students in Special Education classes. The parents claimed that individual tests (i.e. WISC-R, Stanford Binet L-M, Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude, Peabody Individual Achievement Test, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test) used as criteria for placement are all culturally biased tests, and are therefore not valid for use with students of minority origin. A similar suit was filed in 1974 in San Antonio, Texas, by a group of Mexican-American parents against San Antonio I.S.D. Their suit charged that children who spoke Spanish as a primary language should not be placed in Special Education classes for language/learning disabled, but rather in bilingual education classes. The suit further contended that teachers made no attempt to teach the Mexican-American children on an individualized basis with deference to their cultural differences from the majority of children in their classes, but rather had failed the students on the basis of their being "slow to comprehend" presented materials. The parents felt that school personnel did not coordinate efforts to provide students with a curriculum that would meet their particular needs.

Special Education programs throughout the state of Texas were carefully scrutinized during the 1974-75 school year, and in July, 1975, the state's 64th Legislature passed an amendment to Senate Bill 230 (the original 1968 Special Education ruling which set into motion the state's present program

for exceptional children). This amendment stated that criteria for placement in Special Education classes would be more strict in nature, and that copies of all diagnostic appraisal and educational recommendations for students considered for special educational placement would be made available to both Special Education teachers and regular classroom teachers who came in contact with those students, and who were then expected to carry out those recommendations.

It is felt by Texas school administrators and Special Education personnel that this amendment was designed to eliminate from special educational settings those students who had been placed in those settings but did not actually qualify for them. Many students of low socio-economic or minority backgrounds have been sent to Special Education classes because of their lack of educational experiences rather than because of a physical or mental handicap. Additionally, many regular classroom teachers have sent children with discipline problems into Special Education classes in order to rid themselves of disruptive factors in their classrooms. With the advent of individual educational programs for each child placed in a special setting, and regular coordinating efforts by a Special Education supervisor to see that all personnel concerned with those children understand the information contained in those programs and implement that information in their classrooms, the "burden of proof" will be upon regular classroom teachers as well as Special Education teachers to provide an appropriate program of work and information for each

child provided special educational services. It is assumed that teachers will be more selective in their recommendations for children to go into Special Education classes, since those teachers will now be required by law to gain a greater degree of expertise in the areas of test interpretation and will be obligated to implement individual programs in their classrooms for those students who receive such appraisals.

Students who have been receiving Special Education services up until this time have probably benefitted from the fact that they have not been forced to compete with peers on a grade level in which they cannot function; however, because observation of Special Education classes and demographic data studies from the Texas Education Agency over a five-year period (i.e. Annual Special Education Statistical Report results) have indicated that many of these classes are either "remedial" (rather than alternative") or comprise de facto "babysitting" and/or segregational settings, many students have not shown the academic progress one would expect from the materials, appraisal, and consultative monies expended on them (each Special Education teacher unit annually receives $225 materials money, $125 allotment for appraisals, and $150 for consultative services from the Texas Education Agency; each teacher serves 10-20 students).

With all of the aforementioned perplexities in mind, it is evident that a need exists to develop a strategy whereby educational diagnosticians can assist with providing an appropriate, balanced instructional program for

each child; also, assuring communication, coordination, and effectiveness of each child's instructional program by providing appropriate interfacing of regular classroom and Special Education services, responsibilities, and roles.

CONCEPTUALIZING A SOLUTION

While the practicum director did not intend for this practicum design to be viewed as a total appraisal system within itself, she emphasizes that it does in fact establish a device for attacking the identified problem of facilitating planning, consultation, and monitoring. The practicum design, hereafter to be referred to as Educational Based Appraisal System (EBAS), can be adapted by diagnosticians to a variety of appraisal programs, and can be an integral component of any comprehensive evaluation system. The strategy, presented in manual form, offers guidelines and suggested procedures applicable to referral, screening, and diagnosis. These suggestions are synonymous with the goal of this practicum exercise, which was to improve educational programming for handicapped students through:

1. the use of evaluation procedures which are integrated with instructional planning for individual students
2. the systematic sharing of evaluation and instructional information among all participants in a handicapped child's education program
3. the coordination of evaluation services to assure more appropriate and timely assessment of pupil performance

4. the placement of emphasis on an evaluation attitude and approach which encourages the teacher to apply criteria appropriate to a student's instructional program

5. the provision for student and parental awareness of instructional program goals and objectives

The focus of this practicum design was on developing a method for assisting educational diagnosticians with transforming diagnostic information into specific educational plans for individual students. It was intended as a resource to diagnosticians in developing comprehensive appraisal programs, in accordance with the Texas Education Agency's Bulletin 711, "Administrative Guide and Handbook for Special Education" (1973 edition).

DEVELOPING A PRACTICUM DESIGN

Before the actual practicum design (EBAS) is described, the practicum director feels it is necessary to define for the reader the responsibility of an educational diagnostician and describe his/her relationship to the practicum design. For purposes of this project, the diagnostician was to be the person having primary responsibility for conducting assessment of students referred for Special Education services. The diagnostic or assessment process as performed by a diagnostician was to be a prerequisite to the implementation of the practicum design (EBAS) within a school. This diagnosis refers to the process of collecting information which would assist in the educational (behavioral and/or instructional) management of a learner by indicating

appropriate instructional action. Diagnostic information was then intended to provide the basis for identification placement, and program formulation.

In terms of identification, this gathered diagnostic information was to confirm the existence of an educational problem, and was to determine eligibility for special programming or services. Related to placement, diagnostic information was to assist in identifying appropriate instructional environment(s) for a learner. Finally, in terms of program formulation, it was intended to provide the basis for instructional planning.

The functions performed by a diagnostician relative to this practicum design were to be twofold: 1) the provision of data utilized in the determination of a student's eligibility for special services and placement, and 2) the provision of instructionally relevant information required for program formulation. Since eligibility and placement decisions were assumed as prerequisites to the implementation of the practicum design (EBAS), the primary role of diagnosis for this strategy focused on input for program formulation. Inherent in the program design was the need for instructionally relevant information upon which to base instructional planning. Specifically, EBAS requires an instructionally relevant diagnostic approach to assessment. It also requires a behavioral or functional analysis of a learner's level and style of learning as well as the specification of the extent to which that learner does or does not possess the skills and abilities required for instruction leading to mastery.

Instructionally relevant diagnostic information was to be derived from a variety of sources: 1) teacher observation, 2) informal tests, 3) formal tests, 4) diagnostic teaching, and 5) observation of testing behavior.

In order to assist diagnosticians with the implementation of EBAS, the practicum director devised a "diagnostician's package". This component of the practicum contained the following materials:

1. copy of completed diagnostician's EBAS manual
2. diagnostic information worksheet form
3. objective clusters form
4. summary evaluation report form
5. educational program plan form
6. teacher instructional plan form
7. referral for re-evaluation form

Each of the above-mentioned forms and their functions is described in detail in the EBAS manual.

The success of the entire project depended upon the role diagnosticians assumed in the implementation of the practicum design. Because they were considered to be primary persons in the appraisal process, diagnosticians were asked to formulate educational plans derived from instructionally relevant evaluation data, consult with teachers and other personnel involved in a student's instructional program, and monitor the effectiveness of the student's educational plan. Once EBAS was operational in participating school

districts, the practicum director presumed that it would become an enduring major resource to diagnosticians in carrying out these responsibilities.

The following outline briefly details the relationship of a diagnostician's responsibilities in an ongoing appraisal program and his/her role relative to the practicum design:

1. Referral: Referral was to be initiated when a pupil was perceived as having problems which might have impeded his achievement and/or adjustment. Having identified a child with learning and/or behavioral problems, the teacher then referred the student to his school's building screening committee. Since the focus of EBAS was on pupils' receiving Special Education services, the referral step represented the first action which might have resulted in a student's participation in the instruction/evaluation aspects of the practicum design.
2. Screening: Screening consisted of generating and compiling all immediately available data on a referred child.
3. Data Analysis and Alternatives: Data analysis required that a designated committee (usually consisting of a building principal, regular classroom teacher, Special Education teacher, educational diagnostician and/or any other person whose expert opinion might be required)

analyze and interpret the data available on referred students, and on the basis of the available data determine appropriate further activity.

4. Comprehensive Invididual Assessment: Comprehensive individual assessment consisted of the observation, diagnosis, and identification of individual pupil achievement and/or adjustment characteristics. This form of assessment included the following factors: intelligence, educational functioning, socialogical variables, medical and health factors, and emotional and/or behavioral states. Although it was intended to be implemented at the instructional level, the practicum design (EBAS) was dependent upon individual assessment information as a basis for planning a child's instructional program. EBAS further insured a broad approach to assessment which focused on instructionally relevant information.

5. ARD Committee: The Admission, Review, and Dismissal Committee of a school is required by the Texas Education Agency to be composed of at least three members, representing the areas of administration, instruction, appraisal and/or Special Education. This step in the appraisal process is mandatory prior to a student's placement in Special Education services, in accordance with Texas' House Bill 1126

(See amendment to Senate Bill 230 mentioned in the section entitled STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM) and also Senate Bill 980 (pertaining to Student Right of Due Process). This committee considers available information for the purpose of determining the eligibility of students for original assignment, continued enrollment, and termination of Special Education services. For the purposes of this practicum exercise, 12 participating school districts were asked to furnish a building principal, a regular classroom teacher, and a Special Education teacher as contributing committee members. The five diagnosticians involved in the project rotated among districts to serve on ARD Committees, and in special cases (i.e. a severely emotionally disturbed child or a student with an oppressive physical handicap), an outside consultant (psychologist, psychiatrist, physician) would be called in to offer suggestions for the amelioration of symptoms which prevented the child from profiting in a Special Education Setting. At this step in the appraisal process, following the determination of eligibility, a decision on a student's placement by his school's ARD committee initiated EBAS relative to that student. Continuous information was provided to the ARD committee

from the diagnostician who served that school, related to the effectiveness of the child's instructional program.

6. Dissimination: Dissimination is the provision for the dispersal of a written educational plan to all personnel responsible for implementation of a child's instructional program. This may be further supported by conferences between supportive and instructional personnel. The translation of accumulated appraisal information into an educational plan was accomplished in this practicum exercise by utilizing the educational program plan and the teacher's instructional plan forms (see EBAS manual, pp. 101-101c, 135). A child's educational plan (using the two forms together) was developed jointly by a diagnostician and teacher(s) involved in the handicapped child's instructional program during an initial planning conference.

At that point, the diagnostician's role relative to EBAS involved providing leadership in the development of a child's educational plan through translation of appraisal data into instructionally relevant information. In addition, the diagnostician collaborated with all others involved in working with a child (teachers, principal, school nurse, counselor, etc.) in identifying instructional strategies, year-long educational directions, and instructional goals and objectives.

7. Evaluation: A tentative evaluation component for EBAS consisted of (a) the ongoing process of determining the effectiveness of each pupil's educational plan, (b) the annual review of all Special Education placement decisions, and (c) the periodic reassessment of each pupil's eligibility. A systematic follow-up was to be instigated at intervals of no more than three months, with evaluation information being given at those times on the effectiveness of the plan. Because of the time constraints imposed upon the practicum, certain factors of this component (i.e. annual review of all Special Education placement decisions) could not be exercised within the time frame of September-February. However, after EBAS is operational within Collin County's schools for an entire school year, all elements of the practicum design's evaluation component can be functional.

One of the major responsibilities of diagnosticians involved with EBAS was to monitor the continuous effectiveness of a learner's instructional placement and educational program by conducting three-month assessments of that learner's performance. The content of the EBAS practicum design provided a resource for fulfilling this responsibility.

TABLE I

Total personnel involved with EBAS project in Collin County

School District	Number of Sp. Ed. Students	Grade Levels Covered by Sp. Ed.	Number of Sp. Ed. Teachers	Number of Regular Classroom Teachers
Allen I.S.D.	56	K-12	3	19
Anna I.S.D.	25	1-8	1	14
Blue Ridge R.H.S.D.	18	1-6	1	11
Celina I.S.D.	49	1-9	2	18
Community I.S.D.	25	K-8	2	13
Farmersville I.S.D.	52	K-12	3	28
Lovejoy C.S.D.	11	1-7	1	10
Melissa R.S.D.	20	K-6	1	8
Princeton I.S.D.	40	K-8	2	13
Prosper I.S.D.	16	K-6	1	11
Westminster I.S.D.	10	1-5	1	5
Wylie I.S.D.	89	K-12	4	33
Totals	406	K-12	22	194

15

The concept of periodic retrieval of summary evaluation information was incorporated into the EBAS design, as well as a three-month assessment function. These summary assessments allowed for consistent and periodic checks of a learner's progress directly related to his instructional program. Data for a student's summary assessment evolved from two sources--- the sequential cumulation of the teacher's instructional plan forms for that student, and review/assessment of the objective clusters forms pertaining to the student (samples of both forms can be found in the EBAS manual, pp. 136 and 211) which were incorporated into the practicum design. Based upon what the student was taught and presumably learned, that student's cluster summary assessment represented a short-form achievement test constructed by his teachers. The accumulated information from these sources provided a basis for summary reports by educational diagnosticians, teachers, and others involved with the student. These reports were used as supplemental information to assist personnel in reporting student progress, in modifying a student's educational program and instruction, and in making recommendations regarding placement. The results of this periodic summary assessment were reported

campuses. She also relied on the services of the Region 10 Educational Service Center in Richardson, Texas, which serves all of the school districts in the Collin County complex.

The Time Factor

Due to the limitations placed upon the practicum exercise because of a fixed time constraint for the practicum director (deadline of February, 1976), a time schedule was drawn up for the first semester of the 1975-76 school year. Because of these constraints, some areas of the EBAS design (i.e. annual review of all Special Education placement decisions, a step intended to be taken at the end of each school year) could not be completed although they were written into the EBAS manual.

A schedule of personnel involved in the practicum design and time expended on the EBAS project follows:

TABLE 2

Time schedule for personnel involved in EBAS project

personnel	individual clock hours	combined clock hours
1 practicum director	600	600
5 ed. diagnosticians	240	1200
22 Sp. Ed. teachers	12	264
194 reg. classroom teachers	14	2716
406 Sp. Ed. students	1½	609
TOTALS 628	867½	5389

on the summary evaluation report form (see EBAS manual, pp. 150,150a). This form provided a format for submitting pupil progress reports based on information derived from the teacher's instructional plan and objective clusters forms.

Information on each student participating in EBAS was retrieved by educational diagnosticians from others involved with the child; the diagnosticians were then responsible for bringing this information before the ARD committee in that student's school and carrying out procedures and tasks, along with a Special Education supervisor, to assure coordination and continuity by personnel working with a particular child.

ASCERTAINING THE REQUIRED INPUTS

Human Efforts

Persons included in the implementation of EBAS within participating school districts in Collin County, Texas, were five educational diagnosticians employed by the Collin County Special Education Co-op, regular classroom teachers in the 12 school districts served by the Co-op, and Special Education teachers within those same districts. A breakdown of those involved in the EBAS project is as follows:

TABLE 3

Personnel responding to a needs assessment
of revised appraisal processes for Collin County

Personnel	No. of Questionnaires Sent	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Ed. Diagnosticians	5	5	100
Sp. Ed. Teachers	22	20	90
Regular Classroom Teachers	194	126	64
TOTALS	221	151	68

A sample of this questionnaire can be found in APPENDIX A of the practicum report. From responses made to interrogations in this questionnaire, the practicum director could ascertain the attitudes of diagnosticians and teachers toward Special Education services in Collin County schools. The expressed concerns were taken into account when the diagnostician's EBAS manual was developed. TABLE 4 shows the breakdown of responses to the pre-practicum questionnaire:

TABLE 4

Responses to questionnaire concerning needed competencies in specific areas of Special Education instruction

AREA UNDER DISCUSSION	POSITIVE REACTIONS		NEGATIVE REACTIONS		TOTAL
	(Need to Improve Skills)	(Regard This Extremely Important)	(No Need To Improve Skills)	(Regard This Extremely Unimportant)	
1. Planning Effective Staff Development Programs	92	87	59	64	151
2. Counseling Services	46	60	105	91	151
3. Appraisal Personnel	90	118	61	33	151
4. Instructional Skills	107	124	44	27	151
5. Curriculum Development	86	107	65	44	151
6. Supervisor/Consultant Services	39	57	112	94	151
7. Materials Services	79	83	72	68	151

This number of individuals is lower than originally estimated in the proposal for this practicum exercise, due to legislation passed by the Texas Legislators in August, 1975 (H.B. 1126) which froze funds and numbers of Special Education personnel to be hired in the state for the 1975-76 school year. The Collin County Co-op was originally eligible to increase its number of Special Education teachers from 22 to 39, thus more evenly distributing teacher loads by grade levels; however, the Co-op's program was forced to remain as it was in 1974-75, with some teachers' covering a great number of grade levels within one classroom. For this reason, the practicum director and diagnosticians involved in the EBAS project found that it was decidedly more time-comsuming and difficult for those teachers to participate as effectively in certain parts of the project. More will be said about this problem in sections of the practicum report entitled EXECUTING THE PRACTICUM and EVALUATING RESULTS OF THE PRACTICUM.

Facilities and Other Means

The practicum director, who is a member of the supportive personnel of the Collin County Co-op, had access to the facilities of the central Co-op office and all students' files which are kept in that office, as did the educational diagnosticians connected with the enterprise. Because the greater part of the EBAS practicum design involved working directly in the schools with Special Education and regular classroom teachers, the practicum director had at her disposal 12 school districts with a total of 20 separate

The practicum design was developed during the summer of 1975, and was introduced into participating school districts of the Collin County Co-op in September, 1975. Although the EBAS project was designed to be conducted over a period of an entire school year, for the sake of expediency it was piloted in a one-semester time frame. Were the design to have been implemented for a complete school year, the aforementioned time schedule (TABLE 2) would have been approximately doubled.

EXECUTING A PRACTICUM

At the outset of this practicum exercise, the practicum director sent to each regular classroom teacher, Special Education teacher, and educational diagnostician to be involved in the development of the EBAS project a questionnaire relating to their perceived competency requirements for their respective positions. From replies received pertaining to certain areas of concern, the practicum director could determine a needs assessment regarding the role of the educational diagnostician as it related to implementation of programmed instruction for exceptional children in the schools. Due to a ruling by Texas' 64th Legislature in July, 1975, existing Special Education units over the state were not increased from the 1974-75 allocation; therefore, the number of personnel participating in the EBAS project was smaller than that originally submitted in the practicum proposal.

Persons participating in the pre-practicum questionnaire and their frequency of response were as follows:

As the EBAS manual was in the developmental stage, it became apparent to the practicum director that one of the most difficult processes of the practicum design would be the evolvement of workable forms to be used in the functional aspect of the practicum exercise. The forms to be included in the manual had to be as brief and "to the point" as possible, yet completely operable and comprehensive so as to cover all areas of need and meet state-adapted criteria for Special Education. It was also imperative that all forms be coordinated to the effect of not contradicting one another. This stage of the practicum design required the better part of two months' effort. A detailed description and purpose of each of the forms developed for the EBAS project can be found in the EBAS diagnostician's manual.

After the EBAS forms were completed, the practicum director met with the director of the Collin County Co-op and its board of directors to obtain permission for implementation of the practicum design within the Co-op's participating school districts. It was explained that the EBAS practicum design was intended to be a quality-control check to determine whether a child's educational needs were being met. Also, regular teachers as well as Special Education teachers and diagnosticians were to be involved in writing specific educational plans that would hopefully change the behaviors of exceptional children to make them more acceptable to those teachers. Permission was granted for the practicum design to be effected at the outset of the 1975-76 school year, with an introduction to the EBAS project being given to diagnosticians through a three-day workshop prior to that time.

In August of 1975, while in-service sessions for regular and Special Education teachers were being conducted in their respective school districts within Collin County, the five diagnosticians who were to be involved in the practicum exercise met with the practicum director for their workshop at the Region 10 Educational Service Center, which serves Collin County's school districts as well as 69 other districts in northeast Texas. Two days were spent in orientation and familiarizing the diagnosticians with the EBAS format and with the forms which were to be used in the practicum design. On the third day of the workshop, the practicum director took with her to the Center five children, selected from Collin County schools' Special Education programs, to be used in an actual testing and programming situation. This was done so that each of the diagnosticians could apply the EBAS technique to a practical situation, and to determine whether the diagnosticians would see EBAS as a feasible concept that could be used in public school settings. (The testing component of the EBAS model took approximately 1½ - 2 hours per child, depending upon the type and severity of the child's handicap. Diagnosticians were not briefed on the children in advance). One diagnostician complained afterward because the child assigned to her (a learning disabled student) took almost twice as long to complete the testing feature of the project as did a mentally retarded child assigned to another diagnostician. The practicum director explained that this disparity was to be expected in this case since the disabilities of the test group were already known (to the practicum director) and that most

mentally retarded children normally did not perform as well on the test items as did learning disabled children. However, depending upon the test setting, a child's emotional state at the time of testing, and rapport with the examiner, certain children with different types of handicapping conditions might perform equally well or poorly on the different tests in the EBAS battery. All diagnosticians agreed that the practicum project appeared to be a workable concept, with a format uniformity that could be applied in all Collin County schools' being one of its strengths. Concern was expressed over teachers' being able and willing to use the EBAS forms, and that a great deal of the diagnosticians' time would be used in testing rather than in giving input for educational plans. The overall tone of the workshop was optimistic.

When school started, all new referrals for Special Education classes in Collin County schools were deferred for the first three weeks. This was accomplished with the cooperation of building principals and district superintendents in order that diagnosticians might have time to familiarize Special Education and regular classroom teachers with the EBAS concept and their expected roles in the practicum exercise. It was explained to teachers and administrators that all information pertaining to a "Plan A" student served through the EBAS project would need to be correlated in order to effectively draw up an appropriate program for that child. For that reason, "EBAS teams" would be set up in each school, and would consist

of a diagnostician and all teachers involved with a child. (A diagnostician would serve on several "teams" within a school).

When the EBAS teams were effected, they received referrals approved by the schools' ARD committees and proceeded to write master educational plans (see EBAS manual, pp. 101-101c) for those students coming into Special Education for the first time. The teams also updated master educational plans for students already in "Plan A" classes. Some problems arose at this stage of the project, because the question arose as to who (besides a psychologist or diagnostician) was able to ascertain which children were actually eligible for placement. Also, there was some question as to what type of specific educational plan could be written that would be helpful to both a regular classroom and Special Education teacher.

It was agreed that the teachers involved in writing educational plans would not be evaluated on the basis of writing behavioral objectives. The practicum director felt that unrealistic goals would be written into the plans, and that the main thrust of the EBAS project (continued student eligibility for "Plan A" as determined by student progress) would be mis-directed.

The EBAS teams also wrote one teacher's instructional plan, to assist teachers with learning to use that form (see EBAS manual, p. 135) and how to correlate it with the master educational plan for a child. Diagnosticians explained to teachers how to integrate diagnostic information about a

student into his instructional programming. The master educational plans used in the EBAS project were designed to be general educational goals for a child for a period of approximately three months. From those general educational plans, the more specific instructional plans were extracted, and finally, from the instructional plans a teacher was to evolve her daily lesson plans for each child. Utilization of a teacher's information about a child (daily progress, anecdotal notations, health information, etc.) was to be integrated into programming for that child, as was diagnostic information. Diagnosticians also stressed to teachers the importance of systematic accumulation of materials and information that would assist them with the actual teaching process. This accumulation would serve as a quality control of their teaching. It was further emphasized that if a good profile chart of a child served by the EBAS system could be drawn up upon his initial entry into "Plan A", then the process of having to "start all over" every year with that child could be eliminated and any teacher who came in contact with him in succeeding years could follow his sequential progress.

The time schedule for an EBAS team as it pertained to one student was set up as follows: the complete team (educational diagnostician and all teachers involved with a child approved for "Plan A" by his school's ARD committee) met and wrote an educational plan and an initial teacher's instructional plan for that student. The team disassembled, and the teachers individually followed the educational and instructional plans for six weeks,

developing their daily lesson plans from those two documents and updating their instructional plans every two weeks. At the end of the six weeks, all teachers re-assembled, without the diagnostician, to compare input concerning the child and to again update the child's instructional plans in order to best meet his educational needs. This was repeated at the end of the 10th week, with all teachers once again presenting their findings and looking at problems still occurring. At the end of the 12th week of the child's placement in "Plan A" Special Education, the entire EBAS team re-assembled to evaluate the child's progress and to determine whether continued Special Education placement was to be necessary in order for that child to successfully function in a public school setting. This 12th week approximately coincided with the 90-day review period for every "Plan A" student in Texas that is stipulated by the Texas Education Agency in its Bulletin 711: "Administrative Guide and Handbook for Special Education" (1973 edition).

The practicum director found it necessary to start slowly and simply when implementing this practicum exercise in school districts so as to avoid confusion and subsequent resentment among teachers. She found it necessary to defend the EBAS concept to Special Education teachers as well as regular classroom teachers, since most Special Education teachers in the Collin County Co-op had had unpleasant previous experiences with attempting to write educational plans for their students. However, when those teachers found that the EBAS concept did not place diagnostic demands upon them, but rather a year-long directive with three-month cycles, they

were receptive to the system. If, in some cases, teachers felt they were unable to state year-long directives for certain students, the ARD committee in those students' schools were then to state the directives. The ARD committees were ultimately responsible for proving that children were actually eligible for continuing Special Education placement. In such cases, teachers could state three-month goals as part of the ARD committee's year-long directives, thus updating and revising the directives.

Because of time constraints placed upon the practicum director to finish this practicum report, only two elements of the evaluation component of the EBAS model were completed at the time of this writing. However, the reader can be assured that the entire EBAS project, including an annual review of all Special Education placement decisions for participant districts in 1975-76, will be carried out.

EVALUATING RESULTS OF THE PRACTICUM

There were several meaningful results of this practicum exercise, from which the practicum director plans to draw valuable information when revising the EBAS manual and expanding the concept to include additional resources. The most significant finding of this practicum project was that at the present time Texas schools which implement "Plan A" Special Education practice that which amounts to a dual appraisal process. The first, and most commonly applied, type of student evaluation pertains to student placement and the determination of student eligibility for Special Education services

through data presented to an ARD committee. The second type of appraisal, considered by most school personnel to be of lesser importance, concerns veritable programming of students within classroom settings. All resources (personnel, materials, facilities) have been geared by the Texas Education Agency to the first type of appraisal. The practicum director found it initially difficult to convince teachers that productive programming of students could be feasibly effected from existing test results, and that they (teachers) could develop the expertise to produce adequate individualized program designs for different type of students within the same classroom.

After educational diagnosticians had worked with regular classroom teachers for approximately a month to assist them with implementation of the EBAS project, the diagnosticians reported that the majority of those teachers still could not apply teaching methods or adapt materials to fit the needs of individual students, based on diagnostic findings regarding those students. The teachers in question told the diagnosticians they had not been prepared (at the university level) to recognize the symptoms of specific problems of students; therefore, they felt incapable of dealing with handicapped children in their classrooms. Also, Special Education teachers who had been certified prior to 1970 had received training in only one area of special educational teaching in order to qualify for their certification, and were accustomed to teaching children having one major handicapping condition (i.e. a teacher certified to teach trainable mentally retarded children

would have been limited to teaching 6-8 students with I.Q.'s in the 30-50 range). When "Plan A" Special Education introduced the resource classroom concept into Texas' schools, many special educators were ill-prepared for the conglomeration of students with different handicapping conditions they were expected to receive and teach. Those teachers had been dependent upon an outside source (psychologist or regional Education Service Center) to give specific teaching suggestions for their students, and were unaccustomed to preparing complete educational programs for their students. Some previous attempts at writing students educational plans had been undertaken by Collin County Co-op's special educators during the 1974-75 school year, but there was no organized supervision of the undertaking and the overall result was unsatisfactory. Those teachers also felt they were not offering their students an environment condusive to maximal learning, but seemed unable to offer a solution to that problem. Both regular and Special Education teachers were outwardly accepting of the EBAS concept; however, a great number of the teachers who participated in the practicum exercise appeared to be insecure in their roles of implementing the project within their respective schools. This insecurity was possibly the result of inadequate orientation and preparation of the teachers on the part of the practicum director and diagnosticians who were involved with the practicum exercise.

Diagnosticians participating in the EBAS project found that because their time was filled with the testing of prospective "Plan A" students,

they were unable to spend a sufficient amount of time assisting teachers with writing their students' educational plans. This was possible due, in addition to the aforementioned circumstances, to the fact that because the EBAS project was a pilot program, teachers required more assistance than they would have, had they been experienced in using the EBAS process. Additionally, the diagnosticians' test data was found to be irrelevant to many teachers' programming of students. This might have been due to one or both of two causes: 1) teachers could not relate test data to programming, and/or 2) diagnosticians' terminology was not comprehensible to teachers. Several teachers who participated in the project, as well as all of the involved diagnosticians, remarked that a shortage of diagnostic personnel presented a problem, with regard to consultative services, surrounding the preparation of educational plans and teacher instructional plans. Teachers felt the need to be guided in a more personal sense when seeking to implement the EBAS concept in their classrooms.

As it was mentioned in an earlier section of this practicum report (DEVELOPING A PRACTICUM DESIGN), referral of students for "Plan A" Comprehensive Special Education is a vital component of an on-going appraisal process. Particularly during the first few weeks of the EBAS project's being introduced into schools, referral procedures for students were handled in various ways by the diagnosticians working within those schools. In many cases, referral information was not adequate for processing by an ARD committee. This problem made the practicum director aware that in spite of

uniform referral forms which were used in each school, orientation concerning the use of those forms was not extensive enough to ensure that the forms would be used uniformly. Certain sections of the forms (i.e. a child's past testing records; background information on a child's classroom performance) were not emphasized in some of the schools as being information which would be vital to the successful programming of a child. This inconsistency in the completion of all necessary forms soon became an apparent weakness in the early stages of the project, and so was corrected as the project progressed.

Some teachers expressed frustration regarding the evaluation of objectives they set forth for their students in educational plans and instructional plans. A question repeatedly heard was, "Should there be different objectives for different students?" The major concern seemed to revolve around teachers' attitudes toward approaching tasks they were asked to perform (i.e. in their eyes, processes became more important than planning; conversely, the diagnosticians assisting the teachers stressed planning more than processes). Since behavioral objectives were not an evaluative entity of the EBAS concept, teachers relied on the following constructs to assist with their objectives formation: (a) intensity, which related to the amount of attention required for an individual child and would determine correct grouping procedures; (b) content, which pertained to subject matter and teaching strategies; and (c) location, which related to the appropriateness of a child's surroundings for maximal learning benefits.

Regular classroom teachers were more receptive to serving exceptional children in their classes within the EBAS concept than was anticipated by Special Education teachers. In a few cases, Special Education teachers who had been teaching self-contained classes evidenced a possessive attitude toward their students, and were reluctant to recommend mainstreaming those children for a portion of the school day. The only concern expressed by several regular classroom teachers concerned the presence of exceptional children in their classrooms when standardized achievement tests were to be administered. Those teachers felt that the administrators in their particular school districts would not want the expected lower scores of exceptional students to be reflected in total class scores, as these scores might reflect upon the quality of education provided within those districts. (In some of Collin County's participating school districts, achievement test scores are published, by grade level, in the local newspapers; also, in several districts, faculty members are rehired on the basis of their classes' performances on standardized tests). Since achievement tests will not be given in Collin County's schools until April, 1976, the practicum director will have time to work out this problem with local administrators before that time comes. At the present time, the practicum director feels that in order to maintain an equivalent amount of fairness to both regular and Special Education students in regard to achievement testing, the Special Education students should be tested on an individual basis with an instrument such as the

Peabody Individual Achievement Test. The tests would be administered by the Co-op's diagnosticians. While this procedure may seem to be unnecessarily time-consuming, the practicum director feels that more objective test scores can be obtained in this manner rather than if the tests were administered by teachers who might be tempted to "prompt" students. Then, if administrators do not object to a comparison of how exceptional children fare in regular classroom settings to the performances of normal students, the exceptional children could also take the regularly-scheduled achievement tests with those classes and the two scores could be compared. The attitudes that will be displayed by teachers and administrators to exceptional students' acceptance in such a competitive situation will be an interesting side result when the EBAS project is completed at the end of the school year.

On a questionnaire sent by the practicum director to both regular classroom and Special Education teachers, the teachers' reception to the EBAS project was requested. On a five-point scale ranging from "very effective" to "no response", the following reactions were obtained:

TABLE 5

Teacher's Reactions to the Effectiveness
of the EBAS Project within their Classrooms

TOTAL NO. OF TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN ANSWERING QUESTIONNAIRE	VERY EFFECTIVE		MODERATELY EFFECTIVE		NOT VERY EFFECTIVE		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE		NO RESPONSE	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
151	50	33	47	31	30	20	15	10	9	6

A second questionnaire, a sample of which can be found in APPENDIX B, of this practicum report, asked teachers to rate the effectiveness of the students' educational plan forms with which they were personally involved. The teachers' reactions to this questionnaire were as follows:

TABLE 6

Teachers' Reactions to Effectiveness
of Educational Plan Forms

TOTAL NUMBER OF TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN ANSWERING QUESTIONNAIRE	ED. PLAN WAS THOUGHT TO BE EFFECTIVE DEVICE		ED PLAN WAS NOT APPLICABLE TO STUDENT NEEDS		TEACHER WAS INVOLVED IN DEVELOPING ED. PLAN FORMAT		TEACHER RECEIVED ADEQUATE HELP FROM DIAGNOSTICIAN	
	R.C.	S.E.	R.C.	S.E.	R.C.	S.E.	R.C.	S.E.
	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %
	29 30	23 70	22 23	13 40	5 5	10 31	3 3	8 24

REGULAR CLASSROOM 96

SPECIAL EDUCATION 33

TOTAL 129

The practicum director has ascertained that the overall tentative results of this practicum exercise has been positive, judging from changes in student behaviors. A diagnostic/prescriptive match is difficult to attain; therefore, if EBAS is to become a successful system for implementation of Special Education in Collin County's schools and other school districts, there will need to be more concentration on teacher instruction in the use of the EBAS model, and also a more thorough orientation will have to be developed so that all personnel involved with this project will become familiar with its different components and can use them to more effectively program exceptional children to attain their maximal potential for learning.

SUGGESTING FURTHER APPLICATIONS

While the practicum director feels that this practicum exercise has been satisfactory to the extent that the model developed for this project has proven to be workable in Collin County's schools, there has been a need demonstrated for refinements in the areas of orientation and in providing specific guidelines for teachers to use when working with the EBAS system. This will be especially important when the practicum director will not be present to personally direct the project within a school. When these improvements have been developed (see section of this report entitled FOLLOWING UP) to the satisfaction of the practicum director, she will take the project into other Texas school districts which participate in cooperative arrangements similar to that in the

schools in Collin County. The practicum director has contacted Dr. Marian T. Giles, noted author and educator in the field of Special Education, and has obtained permission to work with Dr. Giles in the implementation of this project, in conjunction with other experimental programs which emphasize adaptive behavior techniques, during the 1976-77 school year. Dr. Giles, using materials prepared by Dr. Jane Mercer from the University of Southern California at Riverside (Ca.), plans to concentrate on the improvement of services to exceptional children in 14 smaller school districts in west Texas. (School districts in that area of Texas are small and rather isolated, and so almost all districts with the exception of a few are members of cooperative programs). Dr. Giles has agreed to include the EBAS model in her format in some of the districts. Due to economic problems and also because of parent complaints similar to those mentioned in the section of this paper entitled STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM, the Texas Education Agency is currently taking a close look at the numbers of children served in Special Education classes and is also scrutinizing the handicapping conditions of those students. It seems imperative at this time that programs which are practical and can be understood and applied by personnel in schools of varying size, and which may or may not have resource consultants at their disposal, will be necessary for the continued success of "Plan A" Special Education in Texas. If the improved EBAS model demonstrates a fulfillment of some of the needs of educators who work with exceptional children, and if those

educators can master the required tasks and exhibit confidence about their roles in the EBAS project, then the practicum director will present the refined model and accompanying statistical evidence to appraisal personnel at the Texas Education Agency with the request that it be implemented in numerous other school districts throughout the state. Also, if the project does prove successful to the point of being introduced to the state education agency, the practicum director will contact a publishing agency in order to obtain copyright power of the EBAS model so that the testing and programming procedures contained therein will not be altered.

FOLLOWING UP

In examining the results of this practicum design, the practicum director found that the weakest areas of the design appeared to be the orientation of personnel who were associated with the project, communication with teachers involved in the project concerning their roles and the tasks they were expected to perform, and the need for development of a time line for the sequential progress of the EBAS project.

If the EBAS model (practicum design) is to be successfully refined and expanded so that it can be carried into school districts of different sizes and can be effectively implemented in those districts by local personnel (without the personal oversight of the practicum director), then clarified expansion of the three aforementioned weaker components will be essential

to the project's advancement. The practicum director will have completed, before the beginning of the 1976-77 school year, two additional manuals pertaining to the EBAS project. The first will be entitled "Orientation Manual", and will be designed for all personnel involved in implementing the EBAS project within a school district. The primary function of this orientation manual will be to furnish an outline regarding the EBAS model, which may provide valuable experience and insight to further the cause of Special Education. The orientation manual will contain the following elements:

1. an introduction to EBAS, which will include an overview of the EBAS model and an explanation of terminology used in that model
2. explanation of the underlying concepts in EBAS, which will explain its basic principles, will look at the relationship between evaluation and instruction, will give the advantages of an educational based appraisal system, and will interpret the intent of EBAS
3. reasons for the importance of appraising pupil performance, which will take into account an examination of students' of cognitive and social behavior, will explain the use of evaluation data, and will look at evaluation as a basis of coordination and communication among staff members

4. examination of the basic features of EBAS, which will contain an overview of EBAS as an interface in the appraisal process, will incorporate a discussion of the appraisal process, and will enumerate the major components of the elements of the EBAS project
5. definitions of EBAS roles, which will include those of the EBAS team, ARD committee, building principal, educational diagnostician, Special Education teacher, regular classroom teacher, student, and parents
6. explanation of the implications of EBAS for the improvement of instruction, which will deduce the contributions of EBAS to the improvement of instruction, and will examine the implications of EBAS in curriculum planning and program development
7. survey of the formative development of EBAS, which will scrutinize the development, field testing, and revision procedures employed in EBAS, and will review implications for EBAS and in-service training

A teacher's manual, to be contained in a teachers package, similar to the "diagnostician's package" prepared in the original practicum design, will include a specific description of a teacher's role relative to the EBAS model and an explanation of the resources essential for participation in the EBAS project inside a school district. Within the materials designed for

use in the Educational Based Appraisal System, the term "teacher" (to be used in the teacher's package) will refer to any person having the responsibility for planning and providing instruction. This might apply to a regular classroom teacher with an exceptional child in his/her room, for a Special Education teacher. Even though these teacher(s) may assume varying degrees of instructional responsibility within the EBAS model, each may conceivably be accountable for some aspects of the instructional program. Not only can the areas of instructional responsibility vary among teachers, but also the commitment each makes to EBAS. The practicum director assumes that with improved informational resources available, Special Education teachers will make complete commitment to EBAS. Other teachers will have the choice of making a total commitment, gradually assuming increasing responsibilities, or participating in a consulting capacity.

The teacher's and diagnostician's manuals will contain some overlap in content, although they will be written for two different users. Diagnosticians might find the teacher's manual informative; conversely, some aspects of the diagnostician's manual will be helpful to teachers. Through participation on an EBAS team, teachers and diagnosticians can share information from their manuals as specific topics occur.

Tentative contents of the teacher's manual will be as follows:

1) introduction to the "teacher's package", which will include a description of the manual itself and a description of other

components of the package (teacher's instructional plan, objective cluster forms, and objective cluster summary check)

2) description of a teacher's role, which will give an account of the teacher's role as a member of an EBAS team, a description of the teacher's role in EBAS, and a summary of the skills needed to participate in the EBAS model
3) copy of a teacher's instructional plan, with detailed statements about each of the areas within the teacher's instructional plan
4) information concerning instructional objectives, which will include guidance about the use of instructional objectives, a definition of an instructional objective, how to recognize instructional objectives, the writing of instructional objectives, how to analyze and evaluate instructional objectives, and how to develop criterion measures
5) description of pupil performance assessment, which will contain details of an informal assessment, a cluster profile similar to that in the diagnostician's manual, a summary assessment, and instructions for accessing incidental learning
6) details of planning activities, including the selection of activities specific to instructional objectives, selection

of activities appropriate to a student's ability level, description of the activities, evaluation of the activities, and a copy of the activities section of a teacher's instructional plan

7) information concerning the selection of materials, which will enumerate methods of selecting materials specific to instructional objectives, ways of developing materials specific to instructional objectives, procedures for determining the availability of materials, methods of evaluating materials, and a copy of the materials section of a teacher's instructional plan

8) examples of reinforcers, which will include information concerning the pinpointing of target behaviors, selection of reinforcers, and evaluation of reinforcers

9) information concerning the involvement of others in the EBAS project, particularly students, parents, and other teachers

The EBAS practicum design, with the aforementioned refinements, will represent one alternative or model among many which may provide answers in a logical way to some of the problems that have arisen relative to student evaluation and placement in Special Education services. While the practicum director is not attempting to suggest that Educational Based Appraisal System is "the answer" with regard to

processes, procedures, and materials, she does propose that EBAS does in fact seek to find answers to questions raised by the need to develop the appraisal process as a quality control mechanism for:

1. providing an appropriate, balanced instructional program for each child.
2. Assuring communication, coordination, and effectiveness of the instructional program by providing appropriate interfacing of regular and special educational services, personnel, responsibilities, and roles.

APPENDIX A

COMPETENCY	Community Liaison Personnel In Our Co-op					This Competency Is		
	Definitely Need to Improve Skills			Need No Skills Improvement		Extremely Important	Important	Not Important
	(circle your answer)					(circle your answer)		
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
Counseling Services Personnel								
1. Demonstrating a knowledge of the characterics of the exceptional child and the terminology used in describing those characteristics.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
2. Recognizing special needs of individual exceptional children.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
3. Serving on and making a meaningful contribution to a "Plan A" team.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
4. Demonstrating knowledge and application of the state guidelines for special education, as set forth in the Administrative Guide, Handbook for Special Education, Bulletin 711, Texas Education Agency, as well as that policy set forth by the local education agency.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
5. Providing appropriate input into the total educational environment of the exceptional child.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
6. Demonstrating knowledge and acceptance of the cultural and ethnic groups served by the counselor's individual school and to effectively communicate with students, parents, and community represented by various cultural backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Community Liaison Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer)				Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer)	Important	Not Important
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
(Counseling Services Personnel continued)								
7. Knowing individual school and state requirements for graduagion.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
8. Being able to use appropriate instruments for evaluating the effectiveness of the counselor's interaction with district personnel and the overall effectiveness of the counseling program within the local education agency.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
9. Employing effective human relations skills.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
10. Recognizing the need for positive public relations efforts.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
11. Knowing the appropriate referral agencies available within the local community, and developing a current list of appropriate state and national referral sources.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
12. Working with all staff and patrons, including parents, teachers and students.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Community Liaison Personnel In Our Co-op					This Competency Is		
	Definitely Need to Improve Skills				Need No Skills Improvement	Extremely Important	Important	Not Important
	(circle your answer)					(circle your answer)		
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
(Counseling Services Personnel continued)								
13. Demonstrating skill in communication with parents about individual special educational programs available to the child, creating a receptive climate, and listening effectively to the parent as he identifies his own feelings and concerns for the child.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
14. Demonstrating an ability to interpret results of appraisal to parents and to describe the educational programming and make suggestions for the home management of the child.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
15. Knowing school policies regarding testing information that can be given to the parents and knowing the new state law regarding open records policy and the new family code.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
16. Interpreting student needs and strengths to parents and school personnel in an understandable way.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
17. Demonstrating an ability to provide leadership skills in group dynamics.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Community Liaison Personnel In Our Co-op					This Competency Is		
	Definitely Need to Improve Skills				Need No Skills Improvement	Extremely Important	Important	Not Important
	(circle your answer)					(circle your answer)		
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
(Counseling Services Personnel continued)								
18. Defining the special education counselors role to students, teachers, and administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
19. Demonstrating an ability to assist students with realistic personal, social educational, and occupational planning.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
20. Demonstrate an ability to administer and interpret standardized test information geared to the specific disabilities of a child.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Appraisal Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1 2 3 4 5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5 Important 3 Not Important 0
Appraisal Personnel		
1. Having a knowledge of the characteristics of exceptional children and the terminology used in describing those characteristics.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
2. Serving on and making a contribution to a "Plan A" team.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
3. Demonstrating knowledge and application of the state guidelines for special education as set forth in the Administrative Guide Handbook for Special Education, Bulletin 711, Texas Education Agency.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
4. Applying knowledge regarding recent action at the national level on behalf of exceptional children.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
5. Serving as a consultant (providing direction) in the education of exceptional children.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
6. Demonstrating knowledge of the cultural and ethnic groups served by his indidual school.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
7. Evaluating the effectiveness of his interaction with district personnel.		

COMPETENCY	Appraisal Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1 2 3 4 5	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important / Important / Not Important (circle your answer) 5 3 0
(Appraisal Personnel continued)		
8. Being objective in evaluating himself and others	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
9. Establishing an aura of trust and confidentiality.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
10. Accepting new ideas.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
11. Understanding the need for complete appraisal.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
12. Recognizing the importance of keeping teachers informed of appraisal results.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
13. Communicating effectively with students and faculty.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
14. Understanding the importance of student home environment.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
15. Identifying factors outside the student which affect school achievement and adjustment.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
16. Demonstrating a broad knowledge of a wide array of testing instruments.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0

COMPETENCY	Appraisal Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer)				Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer)	Important	Not Important
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
(Appraisal Personnel continued)								
17. Demonstrating knowledge of appraisal instruments appropriate to the various types of student exceptionality.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
18. Evaluating group test results and effectively communicating results to all publics.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
19. Having the ability to implement a testing program.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
20. Serving as a consultant in selecting, administering, interpreting, and evaluating tests of academic aptitudes.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
21. Administering and interpreting testing instruments appropriate to the measurement of psychomotor skills.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
22. Having the skills requisite to systematic and effective observation of student behavior in a variety of settings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
23. Demonstrating knowledge and evaluation regarding special educational needs arising from information processing breakdowns in students aged 3 through 21.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Appraisal Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1	2	3	4	5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5	Important 3	Not Important 0
(Appraisal Personnel continued)								
24. Using the developmental scale of educationally relevant knowledge, skills, and attitudes and the implications for designing educational plans for the special education student.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
25. Using the principles of tests and measurements relevant to the assessment of the education student.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
26. Designing and using information from informal or non-test assessment that has education relevance.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
27. Demonstrating knowledge of learning theory and the principles of human growth and development.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
28. Selecting and implementing alternate instructional strategies which may be used with the special education student.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
29. Demonstrating knowledge and application skill regarding the development of prevocational and vocational skills in students with occupationally limiting characteristics as provided for in the Cooperative School Program.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Appraisal Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1	2	3	4	5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5	Important 3	Not Important 0
(Appraisal Personnel continued)								
30. Knowing the specialized training opportunities for handicapped students.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
31. Demonstrating knowledge and evaluation skill regarding instructional materials and media available to special education.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
32. Effectively interpreting tests results to teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
33. Using test results diagnosticially in preparation of individualized learning programs.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
34. Writing written reports to the teacher who will implement the educational plan.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
35. Using the pupil assessment data and formulating a written individualized educational plan, interpreting, and demonstrating the plan to the receiving teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
36. Assisting teachers in utilizing appraisal data for the improvement of instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Appraisal Personnel In Our Co-op					This Competency Is		
	Definitely Need to Improve Skills				Need No Skills Improvement	Extremely Important	Important	Not Important
	(circle your answer)					(circle your answer)		
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
(Appraisal Personnel continued)								
37. Conducting in-service training for teachers on utilization of appraisal data.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
38. Assessing interpersonal relationships within local settings.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
39. Demonstrating knowledge of group dynamics.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
40. Demonstrating knowledge and application of local guidelines for special education.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Instructional Personnel In Our Co-op					This Competency Is		
	Definitely Need to Improve Skills				Need No Skills Improvement	Extremely Important	Important	Not Important
	(circle your answer)					(circle your answer)		
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
Instructional Skills								
1. Recognizing the characteristics common to all exceptionalities including normal learning behaviors.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
2. Identifying, sequencing, and implementing the components of each skill.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
3. Identifying desirable behavior for the learner and setting appropriate goals.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
4. Interpreting information from the appraisal process to determine the strengths and weakness of the learner for an educational plan based upon correlation with resource personnel and developing teaching methods based upon the best aspects of many approaches keyed to learner needs.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
5. Evaluating the influence of the learner's cultural, psychological, and physical environment in school achievement and adjustment.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
6. Using knowledge of the developmental sequence in reading for evaluating reading skills in the learner.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Instructional Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer)				Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer)	Important	Not Important
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
(Instructional Skills continued)								
7. Having knowledge of various methods of teaching individualized reading and other language arts.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
8. Using knowledge of the developmental sequence in spelling for evaluating spelling skills in the learner.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
9. Using knowledge of the developmental sequence in handwriting for evaluating handwriting skills in the learner.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
10. Having knowledge of various methods of teaching handwriting and written expression.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
11. Using knowledge of the developmental sequence in mathematics for evaluating mathematics skills in the learner.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
12. Using test interpretations in selecting methods for teaching mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
13. Having knowledge of various methods of teaching mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Instructional Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1 2 3 4 5	Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5	Important 3	Not Important 0
(Instructional Skills continued)					
14. Applying and evaluating knowledge of scope, sequence, and methodology for developing social perception and skills in children.	1 2 3 4 5		5	3	0
15. Demonstrating methods of developing social skills.	1 2 3 4 5		5	3	0
16. Using test results in selecting methods for developing language and applying methods of developing language.	1 2 3 4 5		5	3	0
17. Exposure to methods of behavior modification.	1 2 3 4 5		5	3	0
18. Having techniques and skills for individualizing instruction.	1 2 3 4 5		5	3	0
19. Acquiring and applying knowledge of the developmental sequence in sensory-motor skills for evaluating remediation.	1 2 3 4 5		5	3	0
20. Acquiring and applying methods of teaching perceptual motor skills.	1 2 3 4 5		5	3	0
21. Acquiring and applying methods of teaching using a multisensory approach.	1 2 3 4 5		5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Instructional Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1	2	3	4	5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5	Important 3	Not Important 0
(Instructional Skills continued)								
22. Acquiring and applying methods of teaching gross motor skills using a developmental approach.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
23. Recognizing behavioral characteristics of the learner with sensory deficiencies in developing an educational plan with the aid of supportive personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
24. Demonstrating methods of teaching typing to exceptional children by supportive personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
25. Preparing the student and regular teacher for the regular classroom setting for mainstreaming students.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
26. Using the fine arts as a medium to teach other subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
27. Recognizing that career education is an important part of education for all exceptional children.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
28. Helping the children to learn to use their free time productively both at home and at school.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Instructional Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1	2	3	4	5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5	Important 3	Not Important 0
(Instructional Skills continued)								
29. Acquiring and applying knowledge of scope, sequence, and methodology for developing and evaluating self-care skills.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
30. Working with parents of exceptional learners in the carryover of self-care skills in the home environment.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
MANAGEMENT SKILLS								
1. Compiling and requesting supplies, materials, and equipment needed for the academic year.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
2. Completing and submitting reports and educational plans as requested by Special Education Office.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
3. Devising a classroom schedule must include all personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
4. Preparing and operating multi-media equipment for group and individual instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Instructional Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1 2 3 4 5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5 Important 3 Not Important 0
(Management Skills continued)		
5. Recommending reference books and periodicals related to educating exceptional children that should be added to the library.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
6. Arranging the classroom layout to facilitate student performance based upon personnel suggestions before buying.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
7. Assembling a student file documenting personal habits, attitudes, and progress by way of standardized check list.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
8. Having an awareness of resource people and availability of services.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
9. Being aware of special education policies relating to legal problems which might arise.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
10. Familiarity of commonly used medication and their effects.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
11. Knowledge of specific psychological, physiological illnesses and their applications.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
12. The ability to secure appropriate staff development experiences for all personnel.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0

COMPETENCY	Instructional Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer)				Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer)	Important	Not Important
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
SOCIAL SKILLS								
1. Developing and accepting an accurate perception of himself.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
2. Working effectively with building staff and professional collegues.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
3. Accepting children as people with ideas to communicate.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
4. Setting realistic goals for himself.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
5. Setting realistic goals for each student.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
6. Seeing the teaching role as requiring continuing education with financial help and/or other reward.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
7. Communicating and involving effectively with parents, teachers, and supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
8. Understanding that innovativeness, creativity, and flexibility are a matter of attitude and general outlook as well as ability.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
9. Realizing the impact of reward and punishment in motivation to achieve.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
10. Developing an awareness of non-verbal communication.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Instructional Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1	2	3	4	5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5	Important 3	Not Important 0
EVALUATION SKILLS								
1. Identifying and writing goals and behavioral objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
2. Using feedback to modify an educational plan.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
3. Determining the learner's performance through the use of rating scales.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
4. Determining the learner's performance through the use of questionnaires.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
5. Determining the learner's performance through the use of work samples.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
6. Determining the learner's performance through the use of informal tests.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
7. Determining the learner's performance through the use of observation checklists.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
8. Evaluating any test regarding its usefulness in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Curriculum Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer)				Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer)	Important	Not Important
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
Curriculum Supervisor/Consultant								
1. Having knowledge of the characteristics of exceptional children and the terminology used in describing those characteristics.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
2. Serving on and making a contribution to a "Plan A" and/or "Plan B" team.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
3. Demonstrating knowledge and application of local guidelines in relationship with the state guidelines for special education as set forth in the Administrative Guide Handbook for Special Education, Bulletin 711, Texas Education Agency.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
4. Serving as a leader (providing direction) in the field of education for exceptional citizens.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
5. Demonstrating knowledge of the cultural and ethnic groups served by his individual school district.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
6. Knowing individual school district and state requirements for graduation.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
7. Evaluating the effectiveness of his interaction with district personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Curriculum Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1	2	3	4	5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5	Important 3	Not Important 0
(Curriculum Supervisor/Consultant continued)								
8. Assessing present curriculum(s) and developing a model or plan of action for resolving curriculum problems and identify areas needing revision.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
9. Formulating curriculum priorities in relation to available financial resources.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
10. Assessing the extent to which a curriculum project has been successful in accomplishing broad curriculum goals as evidenced in actual classroom practices and procedures.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
11. Coordinating the development and production of local curriculum documents.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
12. Advising and assisting administrators on the need for district involvement in research activities.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
13. Implementing varied evaluative techniques for assessing teacher effectiveness (e.g., peer-evaluation, observational techniques, self-appraisal scales).	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
14. Assessing teacher performance in classroom management.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Curriculum Personnel In Our Co-op					This Competency Is		
	Definitely Need to Improve Skills				Need No Skills Improvement	Extremely Important	Important	Not Important
	(circle your answer)					(circle your answer)		
	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
(Curriculum Supervisor/Consultant continued)								
15. Assisting in the establishment or revision of a local resource materials center.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
16. Evaluating and selecting materials in accordance with the financial resources of the school.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
17. Assessing the ability of teachers to select and use instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
18. Assisting teachers in using a diagnostic and prescriptive approach to a child's specific learning problem.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
19. Demonstrating good teaching methodology to a teacher in her setting.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
20. Helping teachers to assess and improve classroom social and emotional climates to aid learning and interaction.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
21. Recommending tests appropriate to assessment of pupil performance in a given content area.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
22. Aiding teachers in developing their own pupil evaluative techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	5	3	0

COMPETENCY	Curriculum Personnel In Our Co-op ..... Definitely Need to Improve Skills (circle your answer) 1 2 3 4 5 Need No Skills Improvement	This Competency Is ..... Extremely Important (circle your answer) 5 Important 3 Not Important 0
(Curriculum Supervisor/Consultant continued)		
23. Training teachers to translate their observations of pupil behavior into meaningful instruction.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
24. Demonstrating teaching activities for specific instructional objectives.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
25. Assisting teachers by developing a system for in-service training that will insure communication, cooperation, evaluation, and use of feedback to modify goals.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
26. Training teachers in directing the work of classroom aides or helpers.	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
27. Organizing and conducting meetings for decision making (curriculum meetings, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0
28. Obtaining support services for teachers engaged in curriculum development activities (e.g., released time, secretarial services, resource materials, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5	5 3 0

APPENDIX B

EDUCATIONAL PLANS

EFFECTIVENESS OF EBAS

Check type of classroom in which you teach:

_____ regular classroom setting
_____ modified classroom setting (Title I)
_____ special education classroom
_____ homebound setting

1. Do you feel that individual educational plans have assisted you with planning for the exceptional children taught in your classroom? _____ yes _____ no

2. Do you feel that the educational diagnostician assigned to your school offered adequate assistance with designing individual educational plans for exceptional students in your classroom? _____ yes _____ no

3. Do you feel that test results were fully explained to you when you were preparing to write educational plans for your exceptional students? _____ yes _____ no

4. Were appropriate materials and procedures for teaching the individual exceptional students in your classroom explained to you prior to the writing of those students' educational plans? _____ yes _____ no

5. Were you personally consulted when the formats for your students' individual lesson plans were being developed? _____ yes _____ no

6. Do you presently serve on an EBAS team? _____ yes _____ no

7. Do you feel that the educational plans written for your exceptional students will be helpful to you as a teacher in serving those students' needs? _____ yes _____ no

8. Do you feel that the individual lesson plans were written with each student's needs in mind? _____ yes _____ no

70

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.) Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain, New York, N.Y.: Longman, Green, and Col, 1956.

Bush, W. and Giles, M., Aids to Psycholinguistic Teaching, Columbus, O.: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969.

Commission for the Study of Counselor Education and Practices, Guidance: Guidelines from Kindergarten through College (a position statement), Wolfe City, Texas: Henington Publishing Co., 1969.

Department of Special Education (Texas Education Agency), "Programming for the Language/Learning Disabled Child" (set of 5 booklets), Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1974.

Department of Special Education (Texas Education Agency), "Special Study for the Analysis of Subtests on WISC, ITPA, and Detroit - Report for Pupil Appraisal Personnel", Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1975.

Frost, J. and Minisi, R. (compilers), "Early Childhood Assessment List", Austin, Texas: Texas Regional Resource Center, 1975.

Glasser, A. and Zimmerman, I., Clinical Interpretation of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, New York, N. Y.: Greene and Stratton, 1967.

Hobbs, N., Issues in the Classification of Children (2 vol.), San Francisco, Calif: Joe C. Bass, publishers, 1974.

Kaufman, M., Agard, C., and Vlasak, J., "A Study of the Reasons for 'Plan A's' Non-Success in Certain School Districts in Texas" (a task force report for Texas Education Agency; Austin, Texas, 1972.)

Krumboltz, J. and Krumboltz, H., Changing Children's Behavior, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972.

Messler, Y. and Ander, S., "Teacher's Workshop Manual for Diagnostic and Prescriptive Teaching" (unpublished workshop presentation), Ft. Worth, Texas: Education Service Center (Region XI), 1970.

Ogden, D., Psychodiagnostics and Personality Assessment: A Handbook, Los Angeles, Calif.: Western Psychological Services, 1967.

Piaget, J., Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child, New York, N. Y.: Orion Press, 1970.

Rapaport, D., Gill, M., and Schafer, R., Diagnostic Psychological Testing, New York, N. Y.: International Universities Press, 1968.

Santa Cruz Special Education System, "Behavioral Characteristics Progression Charts" (set of 4), Palo Alto, Calif.: VORT Corp., 1973.

Smith, R. M., Teacher Diagnosis of Educational Difficulties, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969.

Smith, R. M. and Neisworth, J. T., The Exceptional Child - A Functional Approach, Monterey, Calif.: CTB/McGraw Hill, 1975.

Texas Education Agency, "Administrative Guide and Handbook for Special Education" (Bulletin 711), Austin, Texas: TEA, 1973 ed.

UCLA Graduate School of Education, Pre-School Kindergarten Test Evaluation, University of Southern California at Los Angeles (CSE), 1975.

Weintraub, F. J., "Recent Influences of Law Regarding the Identification and Placement of Children" from Focus On Exceptional Children (Vol. 4, No. 2; April, 1972); Denver, Colo.: Love Publishing Co., 1972.